



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/434,082 11/05/99 RYAN

K 303.306US2

021186 TM02/0730
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

FEIKART, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2186

DATE MAILED:

07/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/434,082

Applicant(s)

Ryan

Examiner
B. James Pelkarl

Art Unit
2186



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 18, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 and 29-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 and 29-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2186

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, a data in buffer, a data out buffer, a column decoder, and a row decoder must be shown for each memory device (i.e., DRAM) or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: data bus 120. Correction is required.

Specification

3. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. See below for an example of such.
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
On page 8, the language "N plus M equals eight" appears to be incorrect. The sum of N and M should be sixteen.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2186

Claim Objections

5. The previous objections to claims 5-8 and 29-56 are withdrawn due to the amendment filed 6/18/01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 5-8 and 29-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There is no mention in the specification of several critical features of the claims, specifically, that "each memory device contains a data in and a data out buffer, a column decoder and a row decoder".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2186

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-8 and 29-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al., U.S. 5,875,452.

Katayama et al. teach the claimed invention in a memory system (*note especially Figure 9*) comprising:

a memory controller (*note memory controller 17, via controller 70*) with a unidirectional command and address bus (*note that the address and control lines from controller 70 to the decoders are all unidirectional*),

a bidirectional data bus (*note that data line 56 is bidirectional*), a plurality of memory devices, such as eight, (*note the use of up to sixteen exemplary DRAM devices 22*),

a shared command buffer (*note the registers A and B in controller 70, which are connected to each of the plurality of memory devices 22, as explained in column 26, lines 56-57*) coupled between the command and address bus (18; *note that bus 18 comprises, in part, a control bus and an address bus*) and the plurality of memory devices (22) for receiving and latching commands and addresses, and

a shared data buffer (*note data buffer 78*) connected between the plurality of memory devices (22) and the bidirectional data bus (18; *note that bus 18 comprises, in part, a data bus*) for receiving and latching read data or write data.

Art Unit: 2186

As for the claimed pipelined packet protocol, note column 2, lines 34 et seq. and column 20, line 6.

As for the feature of each memory device containing a column decoder and a row decoder, note column 26, lines 51-57.

As for the feature of each memory device containing a data in buffer and a data out buffer, such was not specifically mentioned in the Katayama et al. system. However the benefits of adding additional levels of buffer hierarchies was well known at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include data in and data out buffers for each of the memory devices 22 in the Katayama et al. system, since these buffers would have made the timing of the transfer operations to and from the shared buffers more efficient (by latching the data, control or address bits so that such protocols as time sharing could be utilized), especially considering the highly parallel nature of the Figure 9 embodiment of the Katayama et al. system.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 2186

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 5-8 and 29-71 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 26-28 and 32-57 of copending Application No. 08/886,753. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each and all of the features of the present claims are included in the claims of the '753 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Although the present application is a divisional of the '753 application, and the divisional resulted from a restriction requirement,

- (1) the examiner concedes that claims 26-28 should have been included in group II, as opposed to group I. However,
- (2) it is noted that *after* the restriction requirement was made, applicant never amended the claims 26-28 to be consonant with the restriction requirement;
quite the contrary,
- (3) applicant added *more* claims directed to pipelining to the '753 and

Art Unit: 2186

- (4) added several claims (specifically 38-43) to the present application which do not even mention pipelining at all.

Thus, both applications have been amended such that there is no longer any patentable distinction between the two sets of claims. Thus, a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection is deemed proper.

The following are situations where the prohibition of double patenting rejections under 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply:

(b) The claims of the different applications or patents are not consonant with the restriction requirement made by the examiner, since the claims have been changed in material respects from the claims at the time the requirement was made. For example, the divisional application filed includes additional claims not consonant in scope to the original claims subject to restriction in the parent. *Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Opticon, Inc.*, 935 F.2d 1569, 19 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Gerber Garment Technology, Inc. v. Lectra Systems Inc.*, 916 F.2d 683, 16 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Peikari whose telephone number is (703) 305-3824.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached at (703) 305-3821.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2186

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



B. James Peikari
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2186

July 28, 2001